

### REMARKS

The Office Action dated January 6, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully noted. Claims 1-44 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 8-13, 17-23, 25, 26 and 31-37 are rejected. Claims 2, 5-7, 14-16, 24, 27-30 and 38-44 were previously withdrawn from consideration in response to a restriction requirement. With this paper, claims 1, 3, 4, 8-13, 17-23, 25, 26 and 32-33 and 35-36 are amended, claims 31, 34 and 37 are canceled, and no new claims are added, so that claims 1, 3, 4, 8-13, 17-23, 25, 26 and 32-33 and 35-36 remain in the application.

#### Amendment to the Specification

On page 2 of the Office Action, the Office objects to the title of the invention. Applicant has amended the title herein to be more descriptive, as required. Consequently, applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the title be reconsidered and withdrawn.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Office reminds the applicant of the proper content of an abstract, but the Office does not specifically object to the abstract; the Office merely recites all requirements for proper abstracts. In reviewing the abstract of the present application, applicant finds no elements of the abstract that fail to conform with the standards and requirements presented on page 3 of the Office Action. Accordingly, applicant submits that the abstract is proper.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the Office objects to the disclosure because the cross reference to related application information should be updated. Applicant has reviewed the cross reference to related application information and has found no information that requires updating or correction. Accordingly, applicant submits that the cross reference to related application information is proper and requests that the Office withdraw the objection, or provide specific objections to the cross reference to related application information if the Office disagrees with applicant.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §112

On page 4 of the Office Action, the Office rejects claims 3, 4, 8-13, 17-23, 25, 26 and 31-37 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the phrase “A chip arrangement” should be --The chip arrangement--. Accordingly, applicant has amended claims 3, 4, 8-13, 17-23, 25, 26, 32-33 and 35-36 for proper antecedent basis. Applicant has also amended various claims to replace “adapted to” with --configured to-- in order to more distinctly claim the invention. No new matter has been introduced by way of amendment.

As amended, applicant respectfully submits that the claims conform with 35 USC §112, second paragraph, and therefore applicant requests that the rejection of claims 3, 4, 8-13, 17-23, 25, 26 and 32-33 and 35-36 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §102

On pages 5-10 of the Office Action, the Office rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 8-13, 17-23, 25, 26 and 31-37 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Drost et al. (WO 2004/012265, hereinafter Drost). Of these claims, only claim 1 is independent.

Independent claim 1 is amended to recite:

A chip arrangement comprising a first chip which has at least one first signal interface with first coupling elements arranged along a first line in a first number density and at least one second chip which has at least one second signal interface with second coupling elements arranged along a second line in a second number density,

- wherein the first signal interface is provided along an edge of the first chip and the second signal interface is provided along an edge of the second chip,
- wherein the first and second coupling elements are configured to permit contactless signal transmission between the first and second signal interfaces,
- wherein the first and second chips are so arranged relative to each other that coupling elements of the first and the second signal interfaces can contactlessly transmit signals with each other, wherein said edges of the first and second chips are arranged in mutually facing relationship,
- wherein the first and second signal interfaces have a respective first and second longitudinal extent along a respective line associated with the respective one of the first and second interfaces, the longitudinal extent of at least one of the signal interfaces along the line associated therewith being greater than a length of an overlap of the two longitudinal extents, wherein said overlap is a distance which a projection of the first longitudinal extent on to the second longitudinal extent has in common with the second longitudinal extent,

- wherein one of the signal interfaces has a greater number density of coupling elements than the other, and
- wherein the coupling elements are coils whose magnetic longitudinal axes are arranged in a horizontal plane in parallel relationship with a surface of the chip.

Claim 1 is amended to more clearly define the manner in which the first and second signal interfaces are arranged. Support for the amendment can be found in the specification as originally filed, such as for example at page 6, line 30 through page 7, line 20, and in Figures 1 and 7. No new matter has been introduced by way of amendment. Claim 1 is also amended to incorporate the features of dependent claim 34, which is subsequently cancelled.

To the extent that the anticipation rejection might be applied to the claims, as amended, it is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

As amended, the invention as in all claims requires that “the coupling elements are coils whose magnetic longitudinal axes are arranged in a horizontal plane in parallel relationship with a surface of the chip.” Contrary to the claimed invention, Drost discloses only capacitive or optical coupling (see paragraphs [0010], [0048]-[0056] and [0101] of Drost). As amended, the claimed invention provides a novel arrangement of coils, which provide an inductive coupling, in direct contrast to Drost. Drost fails to disclose or suggest any such arrangement.

The Office indicates on page 10 of the Office Action that claim 34, which is now incorporated into claim 1, is rejected as being anticipated by Drost. The Office, however, does not provide any reference to a specific page or paragraph of Drost that might contain the features of claim 34. Regardless, applicant has reviewed the whole document and has not found any disclosure or suggestion of the novel arrangement of coils presented in amended claim 1, namely “the coupling elements are coils whose magnetic longitudinal axes are arranged in a horizontal plane in parallel relationship with a surface of the chip.” Consequently, applicant respectfully submits that Drost fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 1, therefore Drost cannot be said to anticipate the claimed invention. Accordingly, applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC §102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 3, 4, 8-13, 17-23, 25, 26, 32-33 and 35-36 ultimately depend from independent claim 1 and recite additional features not recited in claim 1. For at least the

reasons above with regard to claim 1 and in view of their dependencies, applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 4, 8-13, 17-23, 25, 26, 32-33 and 35-36 are also distinguishable over Drost, and therefore applicant requests that the rejection of claims 3, 4, 8-13, 17-23, 25, 26, 32-33 and 35-36 under 35 USC §102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

On page 11 of the Office Action, the Office rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 8-13, 17-23, 25, 26 and 31-37 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Drost et al. (US 2004/0018654, hereinafter '654) for the same reasons above with regard to Drost. '654 appears to be the US equivalent of the PCT publication Drost and also fails to disclose or suggest the novel arrangement of coils presented in amended claim 1, namely "the coupling elements are coils whose magnetic longitudinal axes are arranged in a horizontal plane in parallel relationship with a surface of the chip." Consequently, applicant respectfully submits that '654 fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 1, therefore '654 cannot be said to anticipate the claimed invention. Accordingly, applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC §102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.


Claims 3, 4, 8-13, 17-23, 25, 26, 32-33 and 35-36 ultimately depend from independent claim 1 and recite additional features not recited in claim 1. For at least the reasons above with regard to claim 1 and in view of their dependencies, applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 4, 8-13, 17-23, 25, 26, 32-33 and 35-36 are also distinguishable over '654, and therefore applicant requests that the rejection of claims 3, 4, 8-13, 17-23, 25, 26, 32-33 and 35-36 under 35 USC §102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application as amended is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7.2.09

  
Cathy A. Sturmer  
Agent for the Applicant  
Reg. No. 60,869

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
Bradford Green, Building Five  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468  
Tel. No. (203) 261-1234  
Customer No. 004955